

LC

1011

.H25

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap. Copyright No.

Shelf LC1011
H25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

6.6.

AIMS AND METHODS

IN

CLASSICAL STUDY.

BY

WILLIAM GARDNER HALE,

PROFESSOR OF THE LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN
CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

26.6
55050

—○—○—○—



BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY GINN & COMPANY.

1888.

L C 1011
H 26

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1887, by
WILLIAM GARDNER HALE,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

I DEDICATE THIS ADDRESS
TO MY FRIEND

PROFESSOR E. P. MORRIS

WHOM I WOULD FAIN
PERSUADE.

*Omnis hic sermo noster non solum enumerationem oratorum,
verum etiam praecepta quaedam desiderat : 93. 319.*

AIMS AND METHODS IN CLASSICAL STUDY.

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE MEETING OF THE MASSACHUSETTS CLASSICAL AND HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' ASSOCIATION, BOSTON, 1887.

I HAD planned to speak to you to-day of the various phases of the classical education,—the study of the Greek and Latin literatures as bodies of thought, the study of the forms and constructions of the languages, the study of the history of the peoples, the study of public and private life, the study of art. I had planned to discuss the relation of these studies to one another, and to speak with some detail of the methods by which certain of them might best be pursued. But at the very outset I find a difficulty in my path. Six months ago one would have thought oneself safe in assuming a common opinion in regard to the aim of all this. One would then have said that, while either the classics or the natural and physical sciences, properly dealt with, would teach young students that indispensable and rare accomplishment, the art of thinking, yet they greatly differed as regards the things brought before the mind; and that in the power of the great literary men of Greece and Rome to stimulate thought, to teach a severe taste, to form those qualities of mind and char-

acter which come with a larger outlook on human life and a broader sympathy, lay their special value in a system of liberal education. But since that time a pamphlet has appeared, in an important series of monographs on education, in which the view has been upheld that this common agreement of the past was an error. It is there maintained that the humanistic conception of classical study has passed away, and that, under the mighty impulse of modern science, the scientific conception has taken its place, so that the great aim of classical study (as regards the schools, at least, this is clearly said) should be, and is inevitably coming to be, to teach scientific procedure,—namely, observation, generalization, and proof. And in this paper, after an admirable sketch of the currents that have prevailed from time to time in classical study, the view just stated is urged with such vigor and weightiness that one must certainly set oneself to debating very carefully in his own mind whether it is or is not just, and must have his whole manner of looking at classical education largely determined by the decision to which he is brought. Such a debate I have held with myself, and have not come to share the opinion of the writer. I do not know your convictions. But at any rate, until there shall again be a clear consensus of opinion on this fundamental point, no one can properly speak of the study of Greek and Latin without raising the question, What is the aim of it all? That is, then, of necessity, our first inquiry to-day. By a singular irony of fortune, the writer of that pamphlet is the gentleman in whose company I have the honor—a twofold honor, therefore—to address you,—Professor Morris, of Williams College. The irony has, however,

a kindly side; for, as we appear together before you, with opportunities assured us for discussion after our papers have been read, we may hope to reach, in amicable controversy, a common ground, and possibly even a common settlement of the important point at issue.

At once we are involved in perplexity. The general tone of Professor Morris's preface is not in harmony with the tone of the address which forms the body of his pamphlet. Both preface and address must therefore be considered.

I quote from the former:—

The classical work of the college, at least in the first two years, should undoubtedly deal mainly with the literature and history, with the contents of the writings, not with the form of the language. The arguments, therefore, which would naturally be used in support of the study of Latin in these years are those which are drawn from the excellence of the literature, from the political and social history of the Roman race, and especially from the fact that the most important elements of modern civilization have come from or through Rome. Taking the whole curriculum together, from preparatory school to university, these are beyond a doubt the chief aspects of the question, and it would be a matter of regret to the writer should their omission here be understood to indicate any doubt on his part of their weight as arguments, or of their supreme importance in contributing to culture. The reason for passing them over is a twofold one: first, because they have been often and fully presented; and, second, because any discussion of the college work brings in at once the question of elective studies,—a question upon which the writer had no warrant for entering.

To this statement I heartily assent. It is true, it is admirable. Than the phrase “their supreme importance in contributing to culture” nothing could be more satisfactory. And even if, noting the words, “the

classical work of the college, at least in the first two years," and the title of the monograph, "The Study of Latin in the Preparatory Course," one suspected a certain exclusion which augured ill for the schools, yet one would hope that Professor Morris's perception of the supreme value of the aspects he has spoken of would keep him, when he comes to speak of the philological side of classical study, from claiming for that side more than its just — its great but not supreme — importance.

At the beginning of the address, the writer says, "If any of the views which follow shall seem partisan in spirit, I can only remind you of the extreme difficulty of looking with entire impartiality at one's favorite study, and beg you to make such allowance for professional prejudice as you may think best." Let me, similarly, say that my own special field of investigation is precisely what I judge Professor Morris's to be, namely, comparative syntax. In any case, we start together, in that our special personal interest is on the scientific side, rather than the humanistic. If, then, the discussion of the question which Professor Morris has raised should lead me to the opposite conclusion, it will not be in consequence of natural bias.

The keynote of the address is struck in the preliminary statement on page 1.

Those who desire to see the classics retaining their place must face the fact that the literary spirit of fifty years ago has passed out of sight, and that the scientific spirit has taken its place. I disclaim, therefore, at the outset, any share in an attempt to reconstitute the college curriculum upon the basis of a mainly literary training,— an attempt which would result, in my opinion, simply in a prolonged struggle, disastrous to our higher scholarship, and certain to end in defeat.

Professor Morris then proceeds to show that classical scholarship has passed through four stages since the Renaissance, and that the phrase, "the study of Latin," has correspondingly four senses. It may mean "linguistics," learning to read the language, as it did in its first stage; it may mean history and literature, as it did in its prevailing spirit in its second stage; it may mean rhetoric and composition, the acquisition of the ability to write Latin as an elegant accomplishment; it may mean scientific study. "It is now," says Professor Morris, "in the fourth stage. It means, and is to mean, the science of Latin philology." That this is the drift of the times is shown, he argues, in several ways. First, the great majority of the books on classical subjects now produced in Germany are of a scientific character. Secondly, students are said (I question the statement) not to read so much Greek at Harvard College to-day as they did at Marietta College, for example, forty years ago; and even in Germany, as a German professor laments, students who have spent twelve or fifteen years upon Latin cannot read it after all. "The reason," says Professor Morris, "is that teachers of Latin in our colleges are teaching philology, not linguistics." Further (and here we get the gist of Professor Morris's view):—

The most conclusive proof that philology has taken the place of linguistics is to be had from a consideration of what actually occurs in the preparation and recitation of a Latin lesson.

A chapter in the preparatory lesson-book deals, let us say, with the genitive. It begins by referring the student to certain places in the grammar where the laws of the genitive are given; for instance, that a noun in the genitive depends upon another noun. Having mastered this law, the student goes on to the exercise, where he finds sentences from which he must select the genitives according to their previously learned terminations, just as he might

select the bits of quartz from a pile of pebbles by the quality of hardness. This is scientific observation, the selection of individual objects according to a known characteristic.

The genitives thus collected are, then, in the process of translation, tested according to the new law; the student examines the sentence in which each is found to discover the noun upon which it depends. He will perhaps find that in some cases the form has misled him, and, in the absence of a noun to which they may be referred, some genitives must be rejected as locatives or dative, as among his pieces of quartz the test of the acid might reveal bits of some other hard mineral. This process, repeated with every genitive in the exercise, is a drill in scientific generalization, differing from the same process in actual scientific investigation, only by the fact that the law to be discovered is pointed out at the beginning. It is at the same time scientific proof, since it is the testing of the law under conditions constantly varied.

Still more like the actual work of the investigator is the preparation of a chapter in Cæsar, since here there is no artificial arrangement of sentences, but nouns of all forms, and sentences of different structure follow each other in confusion, as the botanist finds by the roadside here a clover, there a fern.

Now all this has nothing to do with reading Latin.

“We no longer study Latin in our schools [page 14] in order to learn Latin; we study it, and teach it, with primary reference to the science of philology.”¹ We are giving our students drill in scientific observation, scientific generalization, scientific proof. And “all this has nothing to do with reading Latin.”

We see clearly now the field of our amicable, and, I

¹ The phrase science of philology is used by Professor Morris here and in most places in the sense of scientific *procedure* in dealing with the language, not in its common sense of comparative phonology or comparative syntax. For my own part, I wish that we might come in this country, as the Germans have come, to use the phrase classical philology as covering the whole field of classical study,—language, literature, history, institutions, archaeology.

hope, helpful controversy. But before entering upon it, I am disposed to take breath a moment, and to admit that, so far as the facts claimed are concerned, something of what Professor Morris says would appear to be sadly true. I should gladly be relieved of a fear that far too much work in the preparatory school has, I will not say nothing to do with reading Latin, but quite inadequate relations to that matter. To this we shall return.

Let us now, having seen Professor Morris's position, approach the subject afresh, but from essentially the same point of view.

The spirit of the age demands scientific method in all intellectual activity that comes within the domain of science. The scientific habit of mind is a tool of which each one of us, no matter in what field he is to work, must become the possessor. We must all learn to observe, to generalize, and to prove. We shall so learn, if we are under the guidance of a wise instructor, himself possessed of the power and the confirmed habit of observing, of generalizing, and of proving, and engaged in teaching us things the dealing with which calls for the exercise of those operations. Things the dealing with which did not call for the considerable exercise of these operations, even though they might have in themselves an indispensable importance (the case of French and German, as is excellently shown by Professor Morris, is in point), would fail to give us entire satisfaction as material for education. The ideal subjects for education, then, would be such as should combine interest and importance of results with the considerable exercise of observation, generalization, and proof, in arriving at those results.

So far, we probably agree. We must all, at any cost, learn to observe accurately, and to reason accurately

from the facts observed. We must also learn the things that are of interest and importance, even if we have to go elsewhere for training in accurate observation and correct inference. The ideal subjects for education would be those that come under both heads, those that are of interest and importance, and that, at the same time, require to be dealt with by processes that will form the scientific habit of mind. Professor Morris has admirably shown the great value of classical studies on the latter score, a value equal, in the early stage of education, to that of what we may briefly call the physical studies,—and, for the present, at least, even superior, on account of the availability of the apparatus, namely, books, and the poverty of the schools in laboratories. But to possess this value is not enough. For if the physical sciences, even if they should prove to be less suited at the beginning, or even finally, to teach young minds habits of true observation and right inference, yet are of more interest, of greater importance,—in a word, are more practical,—then we ought to reorganize the work of our preparatory schools and colleges by substituting the physical sciences in place of the classics. Up to this point, also, I hope we have advanced in company.

So, then, we have come to the question, What is in the best sense practical? what is of interest and importance in the average human life? This is a very old question, because it is fundamental. But, old as it is, and easy as in truth it is, no settlement has yet been reached. It is thought by many that the current of opinion is setting in the direction of a belief that the things which are of interest and importance to the average man are the constitution and behavior of

chemical agents, of fluids, of the undulations that produce in us visual and acoustic results, of plants, of animals, of the heavenly bodies. For some men, indeed, these are certainly the practical things; and we can, therefore, at once concede a part of the debatable ground. To the man who is to devote his life to the building of railroads and bridges, the most important thing is the knowledge how to build an excellent road and an excellent bridge. To the man who has a genius for inventing improved machinery, the most important thing is to understand what has been done, and to have his powers developed that he may do still better. But we are not discussing the education of the civil or mechanical engineer, the electrician, the practical chemist, the inventor. It is a pity if there is not time to educate them first as if they were to be average untechnical men, and then to add thereto their education as special workers. But let that go. We are speaking of the needs of men of the untechnical classes, lawyers, doctors, journalists, ministers, business men, men of leisure. The truism will be granted us that man is a creature of varied and wide-reaching capacities. To educate him is to arouse these capacities and set them into action, to make him alive to all that touches most vitally the life of his race,—that is to say, to all that is of supreme interest and importance. What, then, are the matters which to the average untechnical man are of supreme interest and importance? On this question I shall call both a man of science and a man of letters to help me; quoting first from the address on the Mission of Science, delivered before the American Association for the Advancement of Science, at the meeting in Philadelphia in 1884, by Professor Thurston:—

What is the object of directing this enormous array of intellectual power into the field of scientific inquiry? Having settled upon the form of the system, and the details of the mechanism by which this development of science is to be secured with greatest ease, accuracy, and rapidity, to what purpose is this great scheme to be applied? What is the use, and what is the object, of systematically gathering knowledge and of constructing a great, an elaborate, system having the promotion of science as its sole end and aim? What is "**THE MISSION OF SCIENCE**"?

The mission of science is the promotion of the welfare, material and spiritual, physical and intellectual, of the human race. It has for its purpose and its object the improvement, in every imaginable way, directly and indirectly, of the mind and the body, the heart and the soul, of every human being. It is charged with the duty of seeking the cause of every ill to which mankind is subject; of finding a remedy for every misfortune to which the race is now liable; of ameliorating every misery known to sage or savage; of seeking ways of giving to all every comfort and all healthful luxuries; of reducing the hours of toil, and offering to the relieved laborer intellectual occupations that shall at once take from him all temptation to waste his life in indolence and dissipation, and give him aid in his feeble efforts to climb upward into a higher life; of enlightening the world intellectually; of giving it leisure to perfect itself ethically, and to gain those elements of character that are so sadly crushed out by the terrible pressure of our incomplete civilization, sentiments of honor and justice, feelings of love and sympathy, and a spirit of devotion that can only be found highly developed in either the simple child of nature, or in the soul that has time, in the midst of a driving world, to reflect, to aspire, and to grow. The true mission of science is one that extends far beyond the workshop of its servants; it extends far beyond our ken, and beyond the range of our mental grasp and farthest view. The great fact that material prosperity is the fruit of science, and that other great truth, that as mankind is given opportunity for meditation and for culture, the higher attributes of human character are given development, are the best indications of the nature of the real mission of science, and of the correctness of the conclusion that the use and the aim of scientific inquiry are to be sought in the region beyond and above the material world to which those studies are confined.

This is the position taken on the question, what is of supreme interest and importance, by a scientific man of great success, himself professionally engaged in directing the training of mechanical engineers. "The use and the aim of scientific inquiry are to be sought in the region beyond and above the material world to which those studies are confined." We can agree to that.

And now for the answer of a man of letters, Dr. Johnson, given in his Life of Milton:—

But the truth is, that the knowledge of external nature, and the sciences which that knowledge requires or includes, are not the great or the frequent business of the human mind. Whether we provide for action or conversation, whether we wish to be useful or pleasing, the first requisite is the religious and moral knowledge of right and wrong; the next is an acquaintance with the history of mankind, and with those examples which may be said to embody truth, and prove by events the reasonableness of opinions. Prudence and justice are virtues and excellences of all times and of all places. We are perpetually moralists; but we are geometricians only by chance. Our intercourse with intellectual nature is necessary; our speculations upon matter are voluntary and at leisure. Physiological learning is of such rare emergence that one may know another half his life without being able to estimate his skill in hydrostatics or astronomy; but his moral and prudential character immediately appears.

Those authors, therefore, are to be read at schools, that supply most axioms of prudence, most principles of moral truth, and most materials for conversation; and those purposes are best served by poets, orators, and historians.

Let me not be censured for this digression as pedantic or paradoxical; for, if I have Milton against me, I have Socrates on my side. It was his labor to turn philosophy from the study of nature to speculations upon life; but the innovators whom I oppose are turning off attention from life to nature. They seem to think that we are placed here to watch the growth of plants, or the motions of the stars. Socrates was rather of the opinion that what we had to learn was how to do good and avoid evil.

Dr. Johnson twice needs supplementing here. We all at times suspect him of imperfect susceptibility to the highest qualities of imaginative literature; and it is in precisely these qualities that literature reaches the expression of that which is highest in the human mind. Secondly, we more than suspect him of imperfect sympathy with that instinct of human nature which, as Professor Morris has told us, has come to play so mighty a part in all our thinking, the imperious desire to know the causes of things,—in a word, the scientific spirit. We are all scientific nowadays. The human mind has taken all knowledge to be its province. We all desire to know the whole of the universe, and the place and part of man in it.

But we cannot know well both the record of nature and the record of man. We must choose, for our main occupation, the one to which our bent inclines, and thenceforth depend, for our acquaintance with the other, upon the saving friction of our necessary intercourse with the great thinking and writing world. We shall do right to follow our tastes, whatever they may be. So much is assured us, and rightly assured us, at some point or other, in the new education. But if our tastes lead us to the knowledge of that which is the great and frequent business of the human mind, we shall choose, with Dr. Johnson, to understand man himself, as he has shown himself in history, and above all, as he has shown himself in that more intimate history which is called literature.

We are dealing here with a point upon which a strange misconception exists. It appears to be constantly assumed that, “discipline” apart, the study of mathematics, of mechanics, of chemistry, of electricity, supplies

not only to the technical worker, but equally to the average man, something which he will be constantly putting into use, while the study of the classical literatures and cognate subjects supplies the student with idle things, mere accomplishments, out of all touch with daily life. The misconception arises from the fact that the so-called scientific studies lead to those marvellous triumphs over our natural lot which have added so much to the comfort and pleasure of living, and to the interchange of thought. But from this fact nothing rightly follows except that the technical worker, and especially the man of inventive genius, must have the scientific training. As for the rest, the blessings of the steam-engine, the telegraph, the electric light, fall alike on the scientific and the unscientific. I am a devout believer in the importance of giving to every student mathematical training — an absolute indispensable in the best liberal education — and a training in some two or three of the natural sciences,—such as botany, physics, and chemistry,—sufficient to afford him some understanding of the way in which scientific work is carried on, and a clear conception of that regular recurrence of like phenomena under like conditions which we call law.¹ But I am an equally devout believer in

¹ I do not believe that, in a well-planned education, the study of the classics could wholly replace the study of the physical and natural sciences. For myself, my first heartfelt conviction that in this world like phenomena recur under like conditions was got, not from the study of the development of the classical tongues, but from work in entomology, outside of the college curriculum, carried on, in successive seasons, under the direction of a classmate who is now a special worker in that field. The development of a language is equally under what we call law; but the phenomena are too difficult, and the tests too little obvious, to serve the purposes of a young student.

the importance of giving to every student of possible humanistic tastes some knowledge of those great literatures, ancient and modern, which, with the great works of art, constitute the most precious — because wholly unreplaceable — achievements of the human race. I deprecate the apparent tendency of our times, which threatens to carry us on to a point at which education will split sharply into two parts: the serious student of literature knowing nothing of natural science, and the serious student of natural science having no catholic introduction to literature, or respect for it. It is the most crying need of education to-day that workers in the classics and workers in the sciences should hold together and insist that education consists of a fairly broad basis of knowledge and sympathies, together with a thorough mastery of one's own powers, obtained by an exclusive devotion, during the latter part of a college course, to a few things — be they classics, or modern languages, or mathematics, or natural science — to which the student's individual turn of mind leads him, in a system of absolute freedom. But, so long as they do not hold together, I must express my conviction not only that it is the very bane of mathematical and scientific studies in a liberal education to maintain that their value lies in their practical applications, but also that it involves an absolute untruth. The uses of mathematics which the average untechnical man makes in his daily life are the operations of addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, applied to calculations of which the reckoning of interest is probably the most complicated; and these matters he learned, not in college, nor in the high or corresponding private school, but in the grammar school. As for geometry, the aver-

age man uses very little of it, while algebra commonly drops wholly out of his life, as clean forgotten as our friends the objectors to the classics tell us Greek and Latin are. And precisely the same thing is true of any practical application, in the life of the average untechnical man, of acoustics, optics, and the like, and pretty nearly true of the forgetting of them. And so Dr. Johnson is practically right. "Physiological learning is of such rare emergence that one may know another half his life without being able to estimate his skill in hydrostatics or astronomy; but his moral and prudential character immediately appears." The things that are of supreme interest and importance to the average man, and even to the technical worker, so far as he can give himself that leisure to perfect himself ethically which Professor Thurston says it is the mission of science to provide some day, in some measure, for the whole human family, are, not the things of external nature, but, to use a phrase that has grown familiar, the things of the mind.

We have, then, so far as strong natural bent does not intervene, two requirements to meet in choosing the studies which shall constitute that ideal and indispensable part of education for which we have been inquiring on behalf of the boy who is to be one of the great multitude of untechnical workers. They must deal with the things of the mind, and they must beget a right habit of mental procedure.

Now the study of Greek and Latin, properly pursued, satisfies the second requirement, so far as the preparatory school is concerned, as well as the study of science can satisfy it, and, on account of the availability of the apparatus, even better; whereas, as regards the things of the mind, kinematics, acoustics, electricity, and the rest

do not deal with them at all,—while the Greek and Roman literatures deal with them in an unsurpassed degree, beside being a large and important part of the record of the intellectual ancestry of the life which we now live.

And here, even if some of my hearers do not now go with me, I am sure that Professor Morris and I are still together. Yet a difference of emphasis—an important matter in educational affairs—begins to appear. He has disclaimed, at the outset, any share in an attempt to reconstitute the college curriculum upon the basis of a training mainly literary, while I, for reasons already given, should gladly see it reconstituted upon such a basis,—taking the word literary (though I should prefer the word humanistic) in the sense in which he himself has used it on page 6 (toward the bottom) as standing for “the study of the form and contents of the Latin writers, the gradual discovery of the facts, and then of the meaning, of Roman history, the investigation of archæological problems, the appreciation of poetic style, the comprehension of ancient ethics and philosophy, the knowledge of Roman daily life and private character.” But I pass at once to the most serious divergence. I have spoken of a difference of tone between the preface and the body of the monograph. With the utmost desire to find a reconciliation which shall leave to the latter the spirit of the former, I am forced to understand Professor Morris’s view as follows: that, though the classical work of the college, at least in the first two years, should undoubtedly deal mainly with the literature and history, yet “in our lower schools we no longer study Latin in order to learn Latin; we study it and teach it with primary reference to the science of

philology"; or, to put the matter more explicitly, as he elsewhere does, with primary reference to the forming of the scientific spirit, through training, mainly in the field of syntax, in observation, generalization, and proof. This is very clear language, and, whatever may be said in the preface, it is in exact keeping with the understanding with which readers rise from the pamphlet. And even if Professor Morris has only been temporarily led into a disproportionate statement through that clear conception of the value of training in the fundamental scientific processes which enabled him to state so well the power of properly conducted classical study to give this training, yet the view which he has enunciated has undoubtedly gained some vogue, and his monograph is cited in support of it. In the opinion, therefore, of many people, among them professional workers in the classics, themselves actively engaged on the scientific side, the fallacy of the monograph needs to be pointed out.

The fundamental error in Professor Morris's view, then, is this: he exalts a habit of mental procedure into the position of the acquisitions gained by that procedure. What the naturalist demands of the student is that he shall use scientific procedure to attain results; namely, a knowledge of the things that specially belong to the province of natural history. The student of nature is not forming the scientific spirit at one time, and getting results at another: he is building up the scientific spirit in the very act of seeking for results. Just as imperatively, our classical student must get his results in the very activity which, rightly guided by the teacher, develops in him the scientific habit of thinking. These results, as we have seen, are, in their highest distinctive aim, an acquaintance with, and love of, the things that

belong especially to literature, — the things of the mind. But the literatures in question are hidden in unknown tongues. Then the great aim of the preparatory schools should be to teach students, by the best means that the teacher's art can devise, to *read* those unknown tongues, and to teach them to read them in such a way as to leave as slight a barrier as possible between the reader and his author. The main duty of the schools is, in a word, to apply the operations of observation, generalization, and proof to the acquisition of the power to read Greek and Latin. All the benefits of grammatical study on which Professor Morris bases the claims of the study of Latin are conserved by the larger theory which I advocate. For the efforts which have been made of late to dispense largely with grammar in teaching students to read Greek and Latin are futile. The workman must know the use of his tools; and the workman who wastes the most time in getting this knowledge is the one who longest postpones getting it.¹ It can be shown with certainty that not one iota of rigorous thinking is sacrificed by a true method of studying Greek and Latin with primary reference to learning to read them. But the teacher's responsibility does not stop with teaching his students to read. A boy is born into the world with tastes and aptitudes in embryo. It is the great privilege of the teachers of Greek and Latin in the preparatory schools to have the opportunity of developing at once the scientific habit and whatsoever

¹ Pessime de pueris merentur praeceptores qui aut regulas nullas tradunt aut certe statim abiciunt, et magnifice promittunt fore ut usu loquendi discantur constructiones. . . . Omnino enim danda est opera, ut tam diu in arte detineantur adolescentes, donec perfecti grammatici, donec architecti sermonis et absoluti artifices evaserint. — MELANCHTHON.

of aptitude there may be for the things represented by the word literature,—to give the student his first large outlook into human life, outside of the country farm and the city street. So, then, the young student of Greek or Latin should be made to feel from the outset that his study of the mechanism through which the Greeks or the Romans expressed thought is to the end that he may be able to read and enjoy a great literature, and that, through every page of that literature actually read, he is preparing himself to read with more and more understanding and enjoyment in the field that remains. All this time, we quite agree with Professor Morris, we must be forming in our young pupil, by incessant watchfulness, the habit of exact observation and sound reasoning. That is one of our interesting and very solemn duties—*one* of the indispensables. But there are *two* indispensables. What can we conceive to be gained, even for Professor Morris's aim, by throwing aside or even obscuring one of them, except that very inability to read Latin, and that indisposition to read it, which we all deplore? Why impoverish the young spirit, up to the time of his leaving the school for the university, by feeding him on method without results, on form without substance? Is it because the humanistic spirit is so rife in our nineteenth century that he cannot fail to catch it, so in the air that he draws it in with every breath, while the scientific habit is so foreign to the feeling of the times that everything else must be thrown aside to further the birth of it in the young mind? I had supposed the opposite. But at any rate, if we wish to prepare for the universities a student who shall feel that Latin and Greek are indeed dead, that they have nothing to do with human life in

the nineteenth century, and who, as early as the elective system of his college allows him, shall shift his scientific activity into a field contiguous to the life of to-day, then let us draw a division line between the school and the college, and let the latter attempt to beget a literary feeling, a humanistic spirit, in students who have thus far been primarily dwelling in cases, modes, and tenses, and in these things, furthermore, not as passports to the literature, but rather as a daily drill in the fundamental scientific processes.

We have now agreed, I hope, upon a statement of the twofold aim for the classical work of the preparatory school,—to teach the student, by methods of exact observation and inference, the art of reading Greek and Latin, to the end that he may be able easily to acquaint himself later with those great commentaries on human life, the Greek and the Roman literatures; and at the same time to deal sympathetically with such parts of these literatures—some of them of the highest importance—as come within the curriculum of the schools.

What, then, shall be the method by which we shall teach this on which all the rest is largely dependent,—the art of reading Greek and Latin?

We are all too much enlisted in the same cause to allow me to fear that I shall give offence when I say that we, preparatory teachers and college teachers alike, fail to give our students a reading power in Greek and Latin. What they get is not the power to read Latin,—to confine what I have to say to that language,—but the confirmed habit of attempting to “dig out” the meaning by a slow, painful, and dangerous process. We set our students to work at learning to read Latin by

a method founded on unreason, a method very similar, except in its lack of the element of pleasurable success, to that by which Jack Horner, in the nursery rhyme, got the treasures of the pudding-dish into his mouth,—a method which refuses to think the thought as the Roman thought it, and substitutes instead a process of hunting up one thing, wherever it may be in the length and breadth of the sentence, and then another, perhaps far removed, and then another, to be patched upon the first, and then another to go with the second, and then another, and another, and so on, with the blessing of Heaven on the result, or not, as the case may be.

This is—I speak with a very near approach to exactness—the process regularly taught in the books that teach anything at all upon the subject in starting a student upon his career in Latin.¹ This is the best method that the study of thousands of teachers in this shrewd age has succeeded in establishing for the understanding of the meaning of a Roman sentence. But it is not the method of the Roman forum and the Roman dinner-table. The Roman orator spoke his sentence straight through, from beginning to end, one word at a time, giving his hearers no opportunity to begin with his main sentence, unless he himself began with it, never turning upon his tracks to enable them, after discovering his verb, to go back and hunt up the modifiers of his subject, and then to go back again and collect, from beginning to end, the modifiers of his predicate. The Roman diner-out told his anecdote one word at a time,

¹ I am indebted to Dr. Bacon, the editor of the Academy, for permission to use again a portion of an article contributed by me to that journal (February, 1887).

in the order in which we now find it. And in some way or other, *by indications somehow strown along the sentence*, the mass-meeting in the forum and the host at the dinner-table nevertheless understood! That was the ancient method. What, then, shall we say of the modern method? Simply that *it is the method of despair*. It assumes from the outset that the mind of to-day is not competent to detect, while the Roman sentence moves steadily on, those indications of meaning which sufficed for the better-endowed Roman mind, and it accordingly substitutes for the Roman way slow and painful processes which could find no possible defence except upon a theory that they are the best of which an inferior age is capable.

My own teaching for years has proceeded upon a very different plan. I have believed that the modern mind could be brought to understand Latin suited to its particular stage of advancement in a graded process precisely as the Roman mind understood it. The method employed under this spirit of hope may be succinctly stated in the general directions to the teacher: Being for a time content to move slowly, in the certainty of great speed by and by in the event of success, select a short Latin sentence and put it upon the board, one word at a time, asking your students, *as each new word is written*, what the Roman found in the position, the inflection, and the signification of that word to convey to him meaning — what light it threw backward upon so much of the sentence as was already past, what light it threw forward upon that part of the sentence which still remained — what indication of the speaker's thought, in short, the Roman found in one word and another, while the sentence moved steadily on, so entirely sufficient that,

when the last word was spoken, the full idea of the speaker had been communicated to the hearer's mind. Guide the student through this wherever he needs guidance. Unhappily, he will for some time need it in large measure, for the absolutely reversed process by which, after the sentence is all over and its meaning has been "dug out," we deal with syntax in the exercise of belated parsing, leaves the pupil's mind very helpless when he is suddenly asked to apply his knowledge to the interpretation of syntactical indications *in situ*. Avail yourself of the resources of the whole class, drawing out one point after another as you question listeners whose interest and attention are sure to be entire. Next put a piece of paper into the hands of each of them, and, taking up a new sentence, and writing one word at a time upon the board as before, set at each word a formal question or succession of questions to be answered formally, but succinctly and rapidly, upon the student's paper. Let the substance of these questions be, What indications of meaning are there here for the word itself? what light does it throw backward upon the words already past, the bearing of which was left in momentary suspense by the Roman way of thinking? what possibilities are there of constructions to follow, if the word is one that requires something else to complete its meaning, and that something else has not preceded it? and is there among these possible completing constructions any one that you may fairly regard as probable?

Then tell him to study his next lesson by himself in the same way, guarding himself at every point from looking ahead in the sentence by keeping the remainder always covered from sight as he moves on (a sheet of

common note-paper can easily be cut to insure this), and to be prepared at the next meeting of the class to tell, rapidly and precisely, how he did it. Let this go on for some time. Frequently repeat the exercise with which you began, of putting a sentence upon the board, one word at a time, with formal questions for terse written answers. After a few weeks, cease to write the sentence yourself, but have the student write it *as you pronounce it*. Give one word at a time, asking questions for written answers, as before. Direct that the answers be placed below, while the Latin sentence constantly grows at the top of the paper. After a few weeks, let there be no more writing of the Latin words; but in all other respects conduct the exercise as before,—with the exception that, as certain kinds of indications of meaning in the individual word and in frequently recurring types of combination become familiar to your students, you will cease to ask questions on these points, and will devote yourself to new ones introduced in the sentences chosen. In no very long time, you will have made your class familiar, from an entirely practical point of view, with all the commonly recurring constructions and types of combination. And you will find that, throughout this time, the method you have been using will have been doing as much as lies within the power of human art to break up that sad inaccuracy of observation and in consequence of inference which, in school and college, lead the teacher in his gloomier hours to doubt the power of education. You will discover that an active or a passive ending, a mode or a tense sign, the mark of a dative or an ablative, produces a discernible effect upon the mind of the student who, in the exercises described above, has been required to tell for every word *when reached*,

and before advancing a step farther, the precise significance of each of these indications of meaning. And — what is more, and, indeed, the soul of the whole procedure — you will find that these graspings of indications of meaning, at first so slow and painfully conscious, will become unconscious and rapid, so that, as you read aloud to your class longer and longer selections, the meaning of longer and longer passages will be carried straight to their minds (as once to the Roman mind) without the need of any questioning from you, and with no translation into English on their part. And you will feel the great satisfaction of knowing that your class is on the direct road, and the only possible direct road, to the reading of the Latin language as the people who wrote it read it, — straight on without returning upon a word, with speed, and with pleasure.

I should gladly treat this matter in detail, if time permitted, for I believe it to be of an importance difficult to exaggerate; but I have found by actual trial that to do this alone requires all the time that can possibly be given to an address in these days of short sermons. I must therefore ask you, if I have succeeded in making it seem desirable that there should be an examination of the method of teaching Latin and Greek, to take the trouble to look at a pamphlet,¹ from the press of Messrs. Ginn & Co., in which I have set forth in detail the method here sketched, and have added a special discussion of its application from the beginning of the preparatory course.

One word, however, I must add now to what I have to-day said on the subject. We have agreed that the

¹ *The Art of Reading Latin: How to Teach it.*

student must, for every reason, constantly be held to exact thinking. But it is a grievous error, permit me to say, to let him into your confidence by giving him to understand that what he is in pursuit of is mental discipline. Mental discipline is not a good that appeals very powerfully to the young mind, with its fresh outlook on this new world. I do not think a naturalist would talk in this way to a young fellow who was about to take up the study of botany. He would rather tell him that it was very interesting to know that which botany has to teach,—the life and growth of plants. So we classicists had better tell our pupils that what they are to find in Latin is the life and growth of the human mind, seen at a great period, the results of which still abide; and that in order to get at this, they must learn how the Romans made people understand what was in their minds. *Cases, modes, tenses, then, are to be studied and treated in the preparatory school as keys to the literature, as direct conveyers of thought from mind to mind.* In saying this, I am not saying that the best way to learn how the Romans expressed their thoughts by cases, modes, and tenses, is to study syntax unscientifically, or that an unscientific grammar is as good a tool, in what Professor Morris calls linguistic work, as a scientific grammar. I do not agree with him that the Andrews and Stoddard of our boyhood is as good a book of its kind as we ever had in our schools, or that, as he seems to hold, Goodwin's Grammar is superior only from the scientific point of view. Every gain in syntactical science is a gain for pedagogy; for it consists in a better understanding of the force of constructions, and a truer knowledge of their actual historical relations. But this means that

the exposition from which the young student is to learn these constructions can be at once sounder, and easier to apprehend and retain.

We may safely say—and any of you will agree with me, who, like myself, were prepared for college on Crosby's Greek Grammar, and then put into Goodwin's Moods and Tenses on arriving there—that scientific clearness assists and inspires as much as it illumines. In my own experience, as a teacher of preparatory studies, and as a teacher in college, I have found that a mechanical and unscientific understanding of the Latin modes and tenses is a greater block to the rapid comprehension of a Latin writer, a more frequent cause of absolute inapprehension of his meaning, than any other cause except the wicked liberties taken with the structure of the Latin sentence by the modern method.

We have at last, with much patience or impatience on your part, got our assumed boy into college, having equipped him, I hope, with a considerable power of reading easy Latin, together with a dawning love for that exact expression of thought touched with emotion or imagination which we call literature,—a larger perception of, and sympathy with, all that has been best in the human family, an awakened and growing sense for the things of the mind. What now are his college instructors to do for him, to carry on worthily the work which you have begun in the preparatory school?

They will still hold fast the two aims which you have held; but they will also add, not too early in the curriculum, one aim more,—the very one which I have urged should not be introduced into the school. They will

make provision for the scientific side of philological study,—philological study pursued, not as a training for science, but in the love of the results to be achieved through it.

For the schools, then, to recapitulate, the two joint aims should be:—

1. To prepare the student to read Greek and Latin with ease and speed.
2. To rouse in him an interest in and love for the things which give Greece and Rome their power and place in the history of mankind.

For the universities, to summarize in advance, the four aims should be:—

1. To continue the work of training the student to read Greek and Latin with ease and speed.
2. To read with him as much Greek and Latin as possible.
3. To display to him as many aspects as possible of those civilizations which have given Greece and Rome their permanent place and power.
4. To conduct him, if he has the bent for philological or archaeological science, into the field of research.

To my mind each of the first two aims which the university teacher should set himself demands, in advanced work, a method of procedure the general adoption of which I do not expect to see in the immediate future.

Our students who elect Greek and Latin throughout their university course (and it is mainly of such students that we are now speaking) are occupied about eight years with these languages. I have urged that they should at the very beginning of their preparatory course be set upon a path that leads to the ability to understand

Greek and Latin without translating,—as a student who has spent some paltry months in Germany expects as a matter of course to understand German. To my full conviction, the classical education is in one important part a failure, if this ability is not attained to a considerable degree in season to allow at least the last two years of the university course to be devoted in part to a true reading of classical literature under the teacher's supervision. This means that, from as early as the beginning of the Junior year, students who have been well trained to this end (I speak only of such) should have opportunities to study without daily translation. The advantages are fourfold. First, the student, by constantly dealing with the Roman page, for example, without the intervention of English, gains much more rapidly in familiarity with the structure of the Roman sentence, and consequently in swiftness of comprehension of the Roman thought.¹ Secondly, the acquaintance of much more of the literature can be made in this way,—about twice as much, I should infer from my own experiments. Thirdly, the student substitutes a direct contemplation of the pictures presented

¹ The case is much less urgent, I concede, with Greek than with Latin. The order of the Greek sentence is not so different from that of the English that one cannot translate a long Greek period currently as it stands, and in the very process be making advances in the power to read and understand without translating. The Roman classical style, on the other hand, differs so entirely from the English style in its unfolding of the thought that the Latin sentence should always be read to the end before it is translated. But, except for an occasional stumbling-block, this preliminary reading of the Latin sentence in itself conveys the author's meaning to the rightly trained advanced student; and the remaining steps should naturally be to proceed to the next Latin sentence, and the next,—unless, indeed, one's aim is practice in English composition, and not the study of Roman literature.

by his author, in place of the contemplation of imperfect and slowly manufactured copies of his own making. Fourthly, this way of reading gives great pleasure. The more familiar one becomes with a foreign language, after the first feeling of mastery has arrived, the more his original delights him, and translation irks him.

Of this matter, as I say in the pamphlet alluded to before, I wish that Professor Greenough would give a full discussion. It had long been my habit to read on with my classes each day, after finishing the set lesson, without translating, but with such grammatical and other comments as should make the meaning clear, and I had intended to break eventually with translation in the class-room in the work of advanced students, confining it to occasional brief written examinations during the term, and the final examination at the end of it; but I should not yet have taken the step had it not been for Professor Greenough's assurances that the plan had succeeded measurably in his own experience. As his method remains undescribed, let me state, as a possibly useful suggestion, the arrangement which I have reached, through an experience of nearly two years.

A lesson is assigned for the whole class, varying in length according to the difficulty of the author, and increasing with the amount read. Of a difficult author, like Juvenal, the whole must be read aloud and commented upon in the class-room. In Pliny the younger, who will serve for a specimen of the treatment of an easier author, the maximum lesson reached (which was held for a good part of the term) was six pages. Each student, reading the whole lesson carefully in his study, marks every passage which he does not feel sure that he understands. In addition, he selects a passage, not ex-

ceeding half a page in length, and prepares himself with pains to read it aloud at the recitation, treating it as he would a piece of English literature. During this reading the rest of the class are advised to follow the reader, if possible, rather than the text; and the teacher, in particular, relies wholly upon him. Failures properly to express the meaning by correct grouping, by the balancing of corresponding or antithetical members, by due emphasis, etc., etc., are corrected, as any other failures would be. Absolute failures to comprehend the author are very sure — even if a relation of mutual trust did not exist between teacher and student — to betray themselves in the delivery,¹ and it is generally easy to detect precisely where and how the student went astray. Explanations are rarely given by translating, but, in preference, others in the class are asked to explain the misinterpreted constructions, to point out the unnoticed correspondences or antitheses, to correct the false grouping or false emphasis. Where, as seldom happens with advanced students, the difficulty lies in the mere meaning of a phrase or word, it seems to me to be generally better to paraphrase in Latin rather than in English, — yet under no iron rule against the admission of that tongue. As we pass over the parts of the lesson which no one has prepared to read aloud, questions are asked by the class; or I myself, in the light of

¹ About this time Elmwood the Quaker, being recommended to him as one who would read Latin to him for the advantage of his conversation, attended him every afternoon except Sundays. . . . Elmwood complied with the directions, and improved himself by his attendance; for he relates that Milton, having a curious ear, *knew by his voice when he read what he did not understand, and would stop him, and open the most difficult passages.* — JOHNSON'S *Life of Milton.*

the experience of former years, point out and meet difficulties. Let me illustrate. In the famous *te consule* passage in Juvenal (11, 33), I should ask the construction of *te*. If I were told that it was ablative absolute (we have Mayor's example for the confession that such calamities occur), I should ask for a different opinion, and should be pretty sure to find some one who had recognized *consule* to be the imperative. That is as comprehensible an explanation as a translation would have been. Undoubtedly it takes more time. But, on the other hand, large parts of each lesson will require no explanation. And everywhere the student is brought into direct contact with his author, endeavoring to understand his thought as he wrote it, and to convey it directly, in all its confessedly untranslatable qualities, to me and the rest of the class. And only at intervals (in addition to the final examination at the end of the term) is an exercise in written translation conducted,—an exercise naturally aiming, when it does occur, at a more exacting standard of literary expression than experience leads a teacher to hope for in daily oral work.

With negligent students such a system would work ruin. But in the case of those who have conceived a fondness for the language, and have gained a command of it sufficient to lead them to elect it in the last two years of their course, the system produces a rapid gain in the power of understanding, and gives a sense of success which is sure to beget zest. As for my own share as teacher, I feel a far keener pleasure in an excellent reading of an elegy of Catullus or an excellent declamation of a passage from Juvenal than in the best class-room translation I have known. And when (for repetition is pardonable in so important a matter),—

when shall we hope to have a true reading of Greek and Latin, if we cannot bring our students to this? if they can never get the flavor of a Homer or a Horace, but only of a compound of their own, made of the products of a different soil and a different climate? If no translation of Horace yet made is Horace, ought not the young men who are the choicest product of our classical training to be brought, in eight years, to a point at which they can read the real Horace? Incontrovertibly "Yes," if it be possible. But possible it is. The way lies in plain sight. And by taking that way, and only so, can we have any considerable hope that our students will continue to love and read their Homer and their Horace and their Aristophanes and their Juvenal, when they come to give all but their stolen moments to their patients, their clients, their parishioners, their silks and cottons.

But one definite test remains to be satisfied, in order to guarantee this method against the name of fad,—the test of translation of passages from the term's work, and of translation at sight, at the end of the term. And herein I find the best voucher for the system. For my advanced classes have gained in power in these respects since daily translation was abandoned.¹

So much for the palpable and easy part of my suggestions.

¹ That wise predecessor of ours in the schoolmaster's art, Roger Ascham, says (*Second Booke, Teachyng the ready Way to the Latin Tonge*), "After that your scholer, as I sayd before, shall come indeede, first to a readie perfitness in translating, then to a ripe and skilfull choice in marking out hys sixe pointes . . . , these books [Cicero, Terence, Plautus, Caesar, Livy], I would have him read now a good deale at every lecture [recitation]; *for he shall not now use dailie translation, but only construe againe, and parse, where ye suspect is any nede.*"

Of the other side, that which deals with the developing of the student's love of the intellectual life, it is difficult to speak in definite words, as it is difficult so to speak on any other matter which touches things that do not fall within the domain of science. A man's education, to employ in part Walter Pater's phrase, becomes complete in proportion as his susceptibility to impressions conveyed by the best things in art, in literature, in life, increases in depth and variety. To help him to develop this power of receiving impressions from a great variety of the best things, we must ourselves feel keenly such of them as come within the range of Greek and Roman literature and life. But I have said only half the truth in saying that. We classicists are no more dependent upon the classics for our whole professional outfit than is our breakfast-table dependent for its supplies upon the contiguous garden and pasture. We may import our cheering cup from China; and we may get a keen stimulus for literary study from Shakespeare or the more Roman Bacon, from Milton, from Wordsworth, nay even from Herrick, and Lovelace, and Waller. And if this be possible for us, so is it for those we teach. I met recently a student of mine of many years ago, who, speaking of his college course, thanked me for two things: first, that I had required him to commit to memory no small number of the Odes of Horace (which acquisition, made against his will, he had come to value and add to); second, that I had advised him to possess himself of Palgrave's "Golden Treasury of English Songs and Lyrics." The poorest teacher gets an occasional compliment, and this was not strictly my first. But it made me feel, more than anything else had done, that my work in those days had not been without results.

And it is worth mentioning, since it points to an attitude toward the intellectual life which, as it seems to me, we who teach the classics are bound to take. We should deal with the literatures of Greece and Rome, not as a distinct and remote entity, but as a precious part of the most precious of all heritages, bringing the sense for literature to bear from whatever quarter.

But we must by no means stop with the literature itself. For, as we have seen from the statement of the third aim of the university course, we must in every way develop the student's interest in, and broad sympathy with, the great range of ancient life, and we must, to that end, offer him not only courses in political history, but courses in Greek and Roman private life, courses at once scientifically and sympathetically arranged and taught. Above everything else in this field, we must offer him an opportunity to know one of the rare treasures of the human race, the greatest of all in its power of developing the true feeling for the best in art, namely, Greek and Roman sculpture — which, of course, practically means Greek sculpture. No one who does not know something of Greek sculpture really knows ancient life. The Greek mind shows itself as clearly in the frieze and pediment of the Parthenon as in the Antigone of Sophocles. No completely intelligent survey of the rise and decline of the Greek character can be had without a study of the sculptures. You find cut into visible form all those tendencies which you detect in the literature and the history. The importance of these things, even to one who has not known Greek literature, may be seen in the attention which the great reading public gives to such papers as Mrs. Mitchell's on Greek sculpture, and Mr. Stillman's on Greek coinage.

There are abundant signs that the world is coming to a conception how large a range human life covers, and of what interest Greece and Rome are to the modern world, which is their intellectual child. Our students, then, must have an opportunity to study Greek art. Of course, in teaching it, or giving such an introduction to it as is in our power, we should proceed under scientific methods, methods comparative and historical. We shall begin with archaic sculpture, not with the Hermes of Praxiteles. But we shall not dwell upon scientific method as we do so. As we come to the Hermes, we shall not thank heaven that its discovery has added to the territory upon which scientific method may occupy itself, but rather that a great work from the master's own hand has been discovered, to be a delight to us, and a fresh witness to the matchless artistic power of the Greek mind. Yet at the same time,—let me say in passing,—we shall gladly avail ourselves of the help of modern science on the practical side, and employ the lantern. I understand that there are those who have not thought well of its use in studying ancient life and art. Such a feeling, I am sure, must pass away. No one objects to referring a student to engravings of works of art, still less to photographs. But the lantern will enable your class to see, with great truthfulness, so far as a single point of view at a time goes, a statue removed from us by the width of ocean, and, further, will enable you, instead of referring them to a cut or photograph in a library which can be put before only one man at a time, to talk to them all together in the mimic presence of the object. What is desirable now is not to discourage the use of the lantern, but to make slides inexpensive and accessible.

That which I have said of the importance of courses in Greek art is, of course, clearly true also for courses in Greek and Roman life. The actual helpfulness of such courses in quickening the interest of students and contributing to the effectiveness of a department has already been shown in our oldest college, through the work of a professor, whose address on *The Realia of Greek Literature*, delivered before the Massachusetts Teachers' Association in 1882, some of you may have had the pleasure of hearing.

How far these things have a bearing on the secondary schools I am not positive. It is clear that the systematic study of archæology and of ancient life should not be attempted by them; but I am sure that it would add greatly to his sense of the reality of his subject and to his interest in the literature and history which he is studying, if a boy who was reading Cæsar and Cicero might see, from authentic portraits, how the man Cæsar, the man Pōmpey, the man Cicero, looked. I am sure that when a boy comes to the *Catiline* of Sallust it will add to the interest of the story if he sees, even in the copy of a rude woodcut, how that prison to-day appears in which the conspirators were strangled. As he reads in Homer of gods and goddesses, it will help his comprehension and greatly increase his interest to see sculptures that shall represent to him how the gods looked to the Greek imagination. Some day I suspect these aids will be used in the schools as irregular auxiliaries, and even to-day they should be given, with all system, in college instruction. Though few colleges are as yet equipped with teachers specially trained in classical archæology, yet I feel strongly that those professors of Greek and Latin who feel the importance of these

things should offer introductory courses in them, with a proper sense of their own inadequacy, but a high sense of the greatness of their subject, until, through the interest which such courses are sure to arouse, they shall make it evident to our larger colleges and universities that each of them should have a professor of classical archæology, solely devoted to his specialty.

And now, under the head of our fourth aim, I come to speak of a matter in which I count upon the satisfaction of having Professor Morris wholly with me: I mean the importance of the scientific study of the forms and the syntax of the classical tongues. For those studies we must expressly provide, on two accounts. A true interest in classical literature, sufficient to hold the student to his classical work, after passing the line of liberty in that system of election to which, in some degree, all the world is coming, will be likely to beget in him a desire to know how these things have come to be as they are — a spirit of scientific curiosity. But besides this, — and it is a matter of importance, — there is a certain danger, of which I have not yet spoken, in the study of literature and art pursued exclusively, — the danger of dilettanteism, of the begetting of a spirit not robust, patient in investigation, long-suffering. The dilettante spirit does not thrive in the very pure and stimulating air of phonetic and syntactic science. These sciences are, consequently (though perhaps Dr. Johnson would no longer agree), subjects of great importance to a man who has been carried far enough along in literary studies to have conceived a curiosity about them. For graduate work, in particular, they are pre-eminently fitted, inasmuch as they offer definite problems to be solved; and this

is the reason why Germany is so prolific in them. I cannot, therefore, but marvel that a public teacher of literature of high authority should occasionally go out of his own excellent way to censure the doing of such work. I should rather endeavor to interest as many students as possible in these subjects; and, in particular, I should urge them upon all who intend, in turn, to be teachers, not in the least—Heaven forbid!—that they may give instruction upon them in the preparatory schools, but rather that, having satisfied their own curiosity by intimate acquaintance, and having learned how difficult these things are, and as yet largely *sub iudice*, they may be content to leave instruction in phonetics, above all, very nearly out of the curriculum of the preparatory school. A little knowledge of Grimm's law is useful and serviceable as adding to the interest of the young student. But I greatly question whether the grammars themselves have not gone too far in the matter of the science of forms, and added to the subjects which the young mind is necessarily to attack other subjects that have no bearing whatever upon the matter of prime importance, the reading of Latin and Greek, and that are far better treated in systematic courses after a large field of the literatures has been traversed, and data of considerable amount have been accumulated. At the risk of being accounted a backslider from the spirit of the age, I shall say frankly that it seems to me that the scientific spirit has got altogether too strong a hold upon elementary classical work, and is proceeding to offer to babes and sucklings things that are almost hidden from the wise and prudent. It would not be a bad limitation to establish, that, while everything in the ele-

mentary grammar should be true, so as never to need to be unlearned, but only sometime to be more fully apprehended, yet there should be nothing in it that should not have a direct bearing upon the primary aim, the acquiring of the ability really to read the languages studied. And, as a second corollary from what I have said, I should add that the study of such books as Sellar's Virgil, and Freeman's Methods of Historical Study, and Trollope's Cicero (in spite of whatever defects), books dealing with the literary and historical side alone, would be of greater practical service to the preparatory teacher than the reading of books upon comparative philology; though it would be excellent if he were to work in both fields. And yet I beg that you will not forget that I said at the outset that my own special interest is in precisely such things as I would exclude from the preparatory school, and that, if I am misled, it is by an error of judgment that does not arise from natural prejudice.

But I cannot finally dismiss the subject of the work of the preparatory school with a statement so one-sided and depressing as this. The school and the university have a common aim, and the gain of either brings a change in the other. The improved methods of teaching in the schools have already made it possible to read larger quantities of the classics in the universities, and in a freer and juster temper. Results still greater, though slower to realize, will in time flow to the schools from the enlarging curriculum and the enlarging spirit of the universities. More and more, students who have chosen the profession of teaching will find themselves interested in the active philological or historical work of the day, and will return to the

universities as graduates, to undertake such research themselves. And more and more they will carry away into their subsequent lives such a spirit as will leave no difference of aim between the leisure hours of the high school teacher and the leisure hours of the university teacher. The German *gymnasien* produce work of the highest order. To say nothing of the monographs which every year contributes to the progress of investigation, the latest and most important summary of Latin syntax, that of Schmalz, is by the director of what we should call a high school; the one great sketch of historical Latin syntax, that of Dräger, is by a director; and the most comprehensive treatment of Latin grammar as a whole, that of Kühner, is by an upper teacher. Such men prepare their students for the universities, and they prepare them well; but, under the goad of the love of science, they accomplish, in the scant leisure of a laborious life, work which is the envy and the reproach of many an American university teacher. And, whether it be cause or effect (it is not wholly either), the true feeling exists in Germany, that the position of the director of a high school is an honor not different in kind from the position of a university professor. We in this country have difficulties of all sorts to contend with (among which not the least is the debasing of the profession of teaching by young men who do not intend to pursue it), and, in view of the gains of the last twenty years, we have far greater reason for cheer than for gloom; but in the day when our high schools and our universities shall carry on the work of investigation side by side, both will stand higher in the public eye, and in both will life bring greater satisfactions.

And so the creed we have reached for the educa-

tion of our classical students and for the life-work of our classical teachers, includes, in due order and proportion, both literature and philological investigation. But let us not, in our love for the latter, for a moment think of undervaluing the former, and defending it as only the hand-maiden of science. To touch for the last time the main note of my paper, let us render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, but let us keep for the study of Latin and Greek the things that belong to them. We shall never propitiate the Cerberus of modern education by assuring him that we are, after all, not humanistic, but scientific, at least in the four years spent in the schools. Cerberus will answer us that if all we claim to do is to train men for scientific inquiry, then they had better get their training in that field which contains the things they wish to know about; that if we have nothing to offer which the natural sciences do not themselves offer, we had better begone. I think so myself. But the fact is, if we will openly say it and stand to it, that, as the scientific teacher has things to offer of which classical study knows nothing, so we have things to offer of which natural science knows nothing; and, furthermore, that these things come nearer home to the heart and daily life, supposing one to be the average man, not the worker in applied science, nor a man with an inborn passion to fathom the secrets of comparative philology or molecular attraction; that they are vital; that they meet us at every turn, unless our lives are solely occupied in getting bread; and that, even in the getting of that bread, they meet many a man far more closely than does natural or mathematical science. Yet we can compel no one to devote his whole education to

these things. On whatever system prepared for college, men are at some point in their course to be free to devote themselves to whatsoever attracts them. They may perhaps choose the classics, they may perhaps choose science; but those who study science, if they are not misled by the unthinking, will study it for its ideal side, because it has an intellectual charm for them, because it is one field of inquiry of the boundlessly curious human mind, not from any mistaken notion that it has more to do with the daily life of the average untechnical man than humanistic study; while those who study the classics, if they do so on any other ground than established tradition, will do it because in the classics we have the recorded experience of the human race at a great period of intellectual achievement, a period of unsurpassed power in putting that experience into words good for all time; in short, they will study these things mainly in the old humanistic spirit. When Greek and Latin cease to stand for the humanities, if ever this shall happen, their day is over, until there shall come a new Renaissance of the human spirit. An age of scholasticism has been rescued by them. An age of materialism may yet be rescued by them. But I do not believe it will come to that. I recognize no such sign of the times. On the contrary, I agree with Professor Morris, — and it is a pleasure to me, in closing, to agree with him,—who wrote to me recently, “It seems to me that we are certainly going to see, in some form or other, a classical revival in this country.”

AIMS AND METHODS

IN

CLASSICAL STUDY.

BY

WILLIAM GARDNER HALE,

PROFESSOR OF THE LATIN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE IN
CORNELL UNIVERSITY.



BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY GINN & COMPANY.

1888.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 598 496 7